## REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 9, 11-15, 18-22, 27-46 are presented for examination. Claims 29, 36 and 39 are currently amended.

Claims 29-46 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanson (U.S. 5,802,149).

First, the methods of Claims 29-46 are "performed by a wireless communication device," as stated in independent Claims 29, 36, 39, 42, and 45. In contrast, Hanson (Fig. 1) discloses a directory assistance system 106 and voice dialing system 107 that are clearly separate from the portable telephones 100-101. Hanson shows a method in Fig. 2 that is performed at the voice dialing system 107 (see col. 3, lines 1-3), which communicates with the portable telephones 100-101 via base stations 102, 103 and a switching center 104. Hanson does not disclose or suggest that Fig. 2 can be performed by the portable telephones 100-101 in Fig. 1. Thus, Hanson does not disclose or teach Claims 29-46. To expedite prosecution, independent Claims 29, 36, and 39 have been amended to further emphasize that the methods are performed "at the wireless communication device."

Second, Hanson does not teach "comparing said recording quality to a quality parameter stored at the wireless communication device" and "prompting a user to re-record said voice tag when said recording quality does not satisfy said quality parameter," as recited in Claim 29. Col. 3, lines 59-67 of Hanson only teaches matching a "received tag" with "stored tags" in a directory 130. An "inexact match" between the received tag and a stored tag reaches some "predetermined threshold of correlation." This does not disclose or teach "comparing said recording quality to a quality parameter stored at the wireless communication device" and "prompting a user to re-record said voice tag when said recording quality does not satisfy said quality parameter," as recited in Claim 29.

The Office Action further cited item 224 in Fig. 2 of Hanson. But item 224 does not disclose the "quality parameter" of Claim 29.

Claims 30-35 depend from Claim 29 and should be allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Claims 38 depends from Claim 36 but should also be allowable for the reasons stated above.

For Claims 39 and 40, the Office Action appears to cite Fig. 2, item 210, Fig. 3, item 248 and col. 4, lines 46-49 of Hanson. But these citations do not disclose or teach "checking whether a new voice tag is a first voice tag to be successfully saved at the wireless communication device; and informing a user of an option to use voice dialing if said new voice tag is the first voice tag to be successfully saved at the wireless communication device," as recited in Claim 39.

For Claim 36, the Office Action cited Fig. 2, items 210 and 218, Fig. 3, item 238, and col. 4, lines 34-38 of Hanson. Item 210 determines if a match is found between a received tag and a stored tag. Item 218 announces a failure if no match is found. Item 238 states "re-prompt caller for tag." These citations do not disclose or teach "checking whether a first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has already been saved at the wireless communication device; providing a user with a first prompt for guidance when said first voice tag has not already been saved at the wireless communication device; and prompting the user with a second prompt for a second voice tag corresponding to a first telephone number when said first voice tag has already been saved at the wireless communication device," as recited in Claim 36. Claims 37 and 38 depend from Claim 36 and should be allowable for at least this reason.

For Claim 42, the Office Action cited Fig. 2, item 208 of Hanson. Item 208 states "match received tag against tags in voice-dialing directory" 130 in the voice dialing system 107, which is clearly separate from the portable telephones 100, 101 in Fig. 1. Thus, Hanson does not disclose or teach "checking whether a feature of said wireless communication device has previously been utilized," as recited in Claim 42. Claims 43 and 44 depend from Claim 42 and should be allowable for this reason.

For Claim 45, the Office Action cited Fig. 2, item 210 of Hanson. Items 208 and 210 in Fig. 2 of Hanson both describe actions of the voice-dialing directory 130 in the voice dialing system 107, which is clearly separate from the portable telephones 100, 101 in Fig. 1. Thus, Hanson does not disclose or teach "checking whether a first feature of said wireless communication device has previously been utilized," as recited in Claim 45. Claim 46 depends from Claim 45 and should be allowable for this reason.

Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 13, 14, 18-22, and 27-32 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson (U.S. 5,802,149) in view of Foladare et al. (U.S. 5,978,671).

First, Hanson and Foladare, alone or in combination, do not teach the methods of Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 29-32 "performed by a wireless communication device," as stated in independent Claims 1 and 29. As stated above, Hanson's method (Fig. 2) is performed at the voice dialing system 107 in Fig. 1, which is clearly separate from the portable telephones 100, 101.

Likewise, Hanson and Foladare, alone or in combination, do not teach the "wireless communication device" of Claims 18-28.

Second, Claims 1, 11 and 18 should be allowable for the same reasons stated above for Claim 29 because Hanson does not teach the "quality parameter" recited in Claims 1, 11, 18 and 29.

Third, Foladare does not teach a "wireless communication device," as recited in Claims 1, 18, 29, 36, 39, 42 and 45. Foladare only discloses wired telephones 10, 75 and a bridging and signaling unit 50 having an associated database 55 (Fig. 1). In Foladare, a calling party uses a wired telephone 10 or 75 to place a call to a subscriber's personal telephone number, which is then routed to the bridging and signaling unit 50. The unit 50 holds the call while a page is sent to the subscriber, whereupon the subscriber calls the bridging and signaling unit 50 using a wired telephone 10 or 75. The unit 50 then bridges the calling party's call with the subscriber's call.

While Foladare may check for repeat callers and for whether caller information is entered in the associated database, Foladare prompts the user directly with the use of that particular feature, e.g., saving caller information (col. 1, lines 60-65; col. 2, lines 26-39). Foladare's user is assumed to know such feature, e.g., saving caller information, is available. Foladare does not disclose determining whether the user has ever used a feature (as opposed, for example, to checking whether the incoming caller is a first time caller or not) (col. 2, lines 49-57).

Thus, Foladare does not disclose or teach "checking whether a first voice tag corresponding to any telephone number has already been saved," as recited in Claims 1, 18, and 36; whether a voice tag "is a first voice tag to be saved," as recited in Claim 29;

whether a feature "has been previously utilized," as recited in Claim 42; and providing different prompts, guidance, or options according to the result of the check, as recited in Claims 1, 18, 29, 36 and 42.

Foladare also does not disclose checking whether a user has ever used some particular first feature (e.g., any voice tag successfully saved) in order to provide a prompt to make the user aware of the availability to use a second feature (e.g., option to use voice dialing), as recited in Claims 29, 39 and 45.

Claims 1-5, 11, 13, 14, 18-22, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foladare et al. (U.S. 5,978,671) in view of Landell et al. (U.S. 4,994,983).

Landell discloses prompting a user to train a speech recognition system while assuming that the user knows the features of the system but needs feedback from the system to keep the user coordinated with the system during its use (col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 13, lines 35-44). Landell does not disclose or teach checks or prompts to determine whether a user has ever used a feature, as recited in Claims 1, 18, 36, and 42. Rather, the checks and prompts disclosed by Landell are merely related to a particular feature that the user is already using.

Thus, both Foladare and Landell make an assumption that a user is familiar with the features being used and only provide the user with prompts for features in use. Neither Foladare, nor Landell, nor any of the other cited references, disclose checking whether a feature has previously been used by the user of the "wireless communication device," as recited in Claims 1, 18, 29, 36-46.

In contrast to both Foladare and Landell, as well as the other art cited, the present application checks whether a user has ever used a feature by checking for a voice tag corresponding to any telephone number (in contrast to just the telephone number currently in use) and provides prompts depending on the result of the check (i.e., according to the user's previous use of the features), as recited in Claims 1, 18, and 36.

In addition, the cited art does not disclose or teach checking whether a user has previously used a first feature in order to provide a prompt to make the user aware of the availability to use a second feature, as recited in Claims 29, 39, and 45.

The present Claims are motivated to make a user aware of an unused available feature, as in Claims 1, 18, 29, and 36-41, or of an unused feature related to a feature being used, as in Claims 42-47. Claims 1, 18, 29 and 36-41 are more specific to the particular features of voice tag saving and voice dialing. Foladare and Landell are related to prompting the user in direct relation to the use of a feature of the system currently in use by the user. Thus, the present Claims are motivated to solve a different problem than the problems presented in Foladare and Landell. Hence the checks and prompts of the present Claims are used in a different method, for a different purpose, and under different conditions from those of Foladare, Landell, and the other cited prior art.

Claims 9 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foladare et al. (U.S. 5,978,671) in view of Landell et al. (U.S. 4,994,983) further in view of Brady (U.S. 5,982,857).

In addition to the reasons stated above, Brady does not disclose or teach a "wireless communication device," as stated in independent Claim 1. Thus, the combination of Foladare, Landell and Brady does not teach Claims 9 and 15, which depend from Claim 1.

Claims 12 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foladare et al. (U.S. 5,978,671) in view of Landell et al. (U.S. 4,994,983) further in view of Bambini et al. (U.S. 5,898,392).

In addition to the reasons stated above, Bambini does not disclose or teach a "wireless communication device," as stated in independent Claims 1 and 18. Thus, the combination of Foladare, Landell and Bambini does not teach Claims 12 and 28, which depend from Claims 1 and 18, respectively.

## Conclusion

In view of the arguments and amendments presented herein, the Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this Application is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 18, 2006 By: /Alex C. Chen/

Alex C. Chen
Reg. No. 45,591
Attorney for Applicants

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-5363
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502